

REMARKS

The Office Action of December 19, 2002 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. The Office Action rejects all pending claims 1-55. By the present amendment, Applicants hereby cancel claims 1-2 and 29-30, and amend claims 3-6, 9, 11-15, 31-33, 36, 38-46, and 52. After entry of the present amendment, claims 3-28 and 31-55 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicates that formal drawings will be required prior to issuance of the application. Applicants submit formal drawings concurrently herewith for consideration by the Office Draftsman.

The Office Action objects to the specification as containing hyperlinks. Applicants have amended the specification to remove three hyperlinks on page 8 and two hyperlinks on page 24. Any remaining potentially browser-executable code may be necessary to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Thus, any remaining potentially browser-executable code does not need to be removed, as the Office will disable any hyperlinks for executable code when preparing the text to be loaded on the USPTO web database. See MPEP § 608.01.

The Office Action objects to the abstract of the disclosure because it exceeds 150 words. By the present amendment, Applicants have amended the abstract to be less than 150 words.

The Office Action rejects claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn because it is improper. The claim element in question, “a previously stored URL,” needs no antecedent basis, as it is clear through the use of the article “a” instead of the article “the” that this claim element introduces a URL that has been previously stored, and does not refer to a previously recited “previously stored URL.”

Claims 1, 3, 29, 31, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Atlas

et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,339 B1, hereinafter *Atlas*). Claims 2, 4-5, 30, 32, 43-44, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Gupta*. Claims 6-7, 15, 33-34, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Light*. Claims 8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Light*, and further in view of Applicants' specification. Claims 9-14, 36-41, 46 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas*. Claims 16-17, 19-20, 48-49, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Light* in view of *Atlas*. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Light* in view of *Atlas*, and further in view of Applicants' specification. Claims 21-22, 24, 26-28 and 50-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Light*. Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Light*, and further in view of *Gupta*. Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Light*, and further in view of Applicants' specification. Claims 47 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Atlas* in view of *Gupta*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above § 102 and § 103 rejections based on the Rule 131 Declaration of the joint inventors submitted concurrently herewith. The Rule 131 Declaration is signed by less than all the inventors because some inventors have left the employment of the assignee or are on an extended leave of absence and are unavailable. Pursuant to MPEP § 715.04, the remaining inventors' signatures are sufficient.

Having established a date of invention at least earlier than the earliest date to which the *Atlas* reference claims priority, the above rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants have amended claims 3-6, 9, 11-15, 31-33, 36, 38-46, and 52 to be in independent form, incorporating the limitations of any base claims, due to the cancellation of claims 1-2 and 29-30.

Claims 1 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kikinis (U.S. Pat. No. 5,794,259) in view of Light et al. (U.S. Pat No. 6,192,380 B1, hereinafter Light). Claims 2 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kikinis in view of Light et al., and further in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,079, hereinafter Gupta). Applicants have canceled claims 1-2 and 29-30, rendering these rejections moot.

The Office Action provisionally rejects various claims under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over various claims in copending Application No. 09/388,353. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection by submitting a terminal disclaimer (filed concurrently herewith) over copending Application No. 09/388,353.

Based on the aforementioned claims 3-28 and 31-55 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the subject application be reconsidered and passed to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,



Ross A. Dannenberg
Reg. No. 49,024

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
(202) 508-9100
Dated: June 16, 2003